

# Who Should Evaluate Teachers' Performance at Schools?

Erkan Tabancalı

School of Education, Yıldız Technical University, Davutpaşa, İstanbul, Turkey

## Abstract

Correct determination of whether or not the objectives are achieved or of the level of achievement of the objectives is vital in educational organizations. In this context, one of the indicators of how teachers serve the organizational objectives is performance evaluation. In Turkish Educational System, the evaluation of the performance of teachers has long been considered a problem. The major question related to the performance evaluation is who should perform it. This study aims to determine who should perform the performance evaluation of teachers and the grounds for why it should be performed by them, based on the opinions of teachers, administrators and education inspectors. This study, which was designed with a qualitative approach, uses descriptive analysis to analyze data. The study included 60 participants, including 20 teachers, 20 administrators and 20 education inspectors. It is possible to say that as a result, the study revealed an agreement that the performance evaluation should be made by school principals. Close observation and knowing teachers better were cited as the primary grounds for this choice of participants. On the other hand, it can be said that participants expressed their reservations about the school principals' "acting biased" and "being incompetent". Another significant finding is that teachers, administrators and education inspectors reported that the issue of "objectivity" may occur with regard to performance evaluation. According to the results from the study, it can be claimed that school principals should be used in performance evaluation process but the issues of confidence, objectivity and incapability should be eliminated.

**Keywords:** Teacher, performance evaluation, MoNE

## 1. Introduction

Organizations are formed for a purpose. The role of administrative staff is to enable the organization to achieve its objectives. Evaluation is an action necessary to determine whether or not organizations achieve their objectives and to make administrative decisions. This is closely related to determining and evaluating the performance of the employees of the organization. According to Çalk (2003), determination of the capability to serve of the employees in an organization and to what extent they perform their duties made performance and performance management more important. De Cenzo and Robbins (1988) pointed out that performance evaluation is performed mainly for three purposes. These are to form a basis for rewarding system, to identify the areas for improvement and the areas needed, and to establish basic standards. Performance evaluation is the set of works to determine the actual achievement of employees in a given period and their potential to develop for future (Uyargil, et al. 2009, p. 210). Performance evaluation is the effort to determine to what level an individual working within the limits of a specified job description achieved this (Fındıkçı, 1999, p.297).

The organizational system aiming to plan, evaluate and improve the performance of employees considering the concept of performance evaluation as a dynamic process is today called as performance management system (Uyargil, 2007, p. 2). Performance evaluation is the process in which an evaluator evaluates performance of employees in their jobs against pre-established standards and by way of measurement (Palmer, 1993, p. 9). Audit can be considered as the process of finding out that organizational actions are in conformance with the established standards and guidelines in line with the objectives set. The main purpose of audit is to determine to what level the objectives of organization are achieved, to take the necessary actions to get the best results and to improve the process (Aydim, 1986, p.1). Audit can be thought as a bonding agent for successful school. The function of audit in schools is to bind different elements of educational effectiveness in the entire functioning of school. In other words, school achieves its objectives once teachers adopt the common goals for students and complement each other's education and auditors' works with teachers in a way consistent with the way in which teachers work with their students (Aksu ve AĞAOĞLU, 2014 p.8). Performance evaluation is defined by the Supervisory Board of the Ministry of National Education (2005) as auditing an organization and operations of its staff to see whether resources are managed in line with the principles of efficiency, effectiveness, prudence based on the pre-established criteria, and the requirements of public responsibility are met (Supervisory Board of MoE, 2005).

Results of performance evaluation are used to perform the functions such as organization's human resources planning, wage management, training and development of employees, career management and termination etc. In addition, performance evaluations provide benefits severally for both evaluators and those who are evaluated and organizations. One of the most important areas of audit and evaluations is the evaluation of teachers' performance. Performance refers to the level of accomplishment of a given task by an individual. Performance evaluation includes the assessment of achievement as well as of failure (Aydim, 2005, p.145). Assessing an

employee of an organization as a part of performance evaluation is a difficult process requiring patience. It is because, today, the work performance of employees is affected by many factors (Argon, 2010, p.140). The more successful the performance evaluation of employees in organizations, the higher the possibility of achieving organizational objectives. Therefore, the question of who will perform the performance evaluation is much debated. The body of literature includes many different points of view on the matter.

Who will perform the performance evaluation is determined based on the evaluation technique to be selected depending on management and human resources policies of the organization (Uyargil et al., 2009, p.213). Despite there are differing opinions on who should perform the performance evaluation, the most prominent ones are the approaches like evaluation by immediate supervisor, by colleagues (peers), by subordinates, and by clients as well as self-evaluation and 360 degree feedback. Sabuncuoglu (2000) cites evaluation by managers, self-evaluation, by colleagues, by subordinates, computer-aided evaluation, by clients and 360 degree evaluation.

One of the characteristics that an effective performance evaluation system should have is to ensure that all parties affected by the process are effectively involved in the efforts to decide on achievement goals, criteria and how these will be measured (Azumi and Lerman, 1987; Baret, 1986; Boyd, 1989; Gary, 2003; Akt. Tonbul, 2009). Audit of education should not be left only to inspectors, and school administration and group leaders should be enabled to perform more effective -close and continuous- assistance, support, audit and evaluation (Topçu, 2010). In recent years, there is a tendency in different countries that all stakeholders are ensured to be involved in management and audit of audit institutions (Demirkasimoğlu, 2011). It was found out that with the alternative audit approaches of cognitive coaching, mentoring, colleague support and action research, teachers benefit from the professional experiences of each other and have a greater opportunity to be involved in the process, and individual self-determination and spirit of cooperation are developed (Gündüz ve Balyer, 2011). A study on "model for performance evaluation of teachers and personal record reports" conducted upon request of EARGED (2001) recommends to perform multiple-data-source evaluation to evaluate performance. Following this study, the Ministry of National Education adopted the multiple-data-source "Performance Evaluation Model" in evaluating performance. In this system, for educational employees, the auditee, their supervisors, colleagues and audit group are used as data sources (Akbaba Altun, Memişoğlu, 2008a, p.8). The Performance Management in School initiated by MoNE EARGED (2006) aimed to ensure the collective involvement of parents, student, teacher, colleagues (of same group), administrator and inspector (Eroğlu and Erden, 2006). In the relevant studies (Bostancı, 2004; Çolak, 2007), teachers and administrators were involved in the applicability of performance management criteria (Günbayı and Yıldırım, 2012). The provision on Performance Evaluation of Teachers of the Regulation on Ministry of National Education Appointment and Change of Place of Duty as entered into force upon publication in Official Gazette of 17 April 2015 and introducing significant changes leaves it to the directors of organization to perform the performance evaluation of teachers (Official Gazette, 2015).

According to the aforementioned, it can be noted that today, quite different evaluation options have come to the fore and adopted in contrary to audit/inspection by Education inspectors, which has been a longstanding practice in Turkish Educational System. Studies show that how the performance evaluation of teachers should be and who should perform it are ongoing questions in Turkish Education System for long years. And this study aimed to shed light on the opinions of education inspectors, administrators and teachers to determine who should perform the performance evaluation of teachers and what are the grounds underlying their choices.

## 2. Method

This study, which was designed with a qualitative approach, uses phenomenological design. Phenomenological design is a design which is used to ensure expression of points of view, perceptions, experiences and emotions about a phenomenon which is not expressly voiced and is based on qualitative approach in collecting and analyzing data (Berg and Lune, 2012; Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002). Phenomenological design focuses on phenomena which we sense but do not have a deep understanding of (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005, p.72). This study aims to reveal and interpret teachers', administrators' and inspectors' perceptions of who should perform the performance evaluation on what grounds.

### 2.1 Study group

In this study, maximum variation sampling, which is a purposeful sampling method, was chosen to uncover the participants' differing points of view on performance evaluation of teachers and the common and shared phenomena in these differences. In the context of qualitative approach, maximum variation sampling, with no aim of generalization, (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005) aspires to ensure diversity for phenomenon and show the similarities of this diversity in line with study subject (Creswell, 2012; McMillan & Schumaer, 2006; Neuman, 2006; Onwuegbuzie and Collins, 2007). Accordingly, a study group of 60 participants was formed with 20 participants from each of teachers, administrators and inspectors, to obtain diverse data required to be obtained

within the scope of the study.

Considering the individual characteristics of the participants, 8 out of 20 teachers were identified to be primary school teachers and 12 secondary school teachers. 10 out of all teachers is female and 10 male. 14 teachers had 1 to 10 years of seniority and 6 teachers 10 to 20 years of seniority. 8 out of teachers are classroom teachers, 3 teachers of applied courses (physical education, music, and drawing), 6 of mathematics-sciences, and 3 of social sciences-Turkish language. 6 out of administrators are school principals and 14 deputy principals. 4 out of school principals served at the level of secondary education while 2 served at the level of primary education. 9 out of deputy principals served at the level of secondary education while 5 served at the level of primary education. 1 of administrators is female and 19 male. 6 of administrators had 10 to 15 years of seniority, 10 with 15 to 20 years of seniority, 4 with a seniority of 21 years and above. All of education inspectors were male. 13 of them had 15 to 20 years of seniority and 7 with seniority of 21 years and above. In respect of the aforementioned characteristics, it is assumed that participants provide the utmost diversity that the researchers desired to achieve.

### *2.2 Data collection tool*

Semi-structured interview questions elaborated by researchers were used to uncover the opinions of education inspectors, administrators and teachers on who should perform the performance evaluation of teachers. Prior to the preparation of interview questions, relevant body of literature was reviewed to form theoretical base of the study and then the relevant questions were elaborated. Prior to deciding on the questions, opinions of 2 teachers, 2 administrators and 2 education inspectors were obtained by use of focus group discussion and the questions took their final form based on their opinions. Discussions were made in the respective schools of the participants and at the university by obtaining their opinions. The necessary clarifications were provided to participants to make them comfortable and objective and the interview environment was set accordingly. They were ensured to be relaxed by providing them necessary clarifications about the course and results of the study. Interviews were made in February to March 2016.

### *2.3 Analysis of data*

Descriptive analysis was used to analyze the data collected under the study. In descriptive analysis, direct quotation is often included to reflect the opinions of the subject interviewed or observed in a conspicuous way. In this type of analysis, goal is to present the findings in an organized and interpreted way (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005, p. 224). In evaluating the findings, opinions from each group of participants were assigned with a frequency and indicated in separate sections. Evaluations were made based first on the opinions on who should perform the performance evaluation of teachers and then on the (positive and negative) grounds of the opinions. At the end of the study, the shared findings were presented in a systematic manner. In analyzing data, statements of the participants were coded and quoted. Teachers were assigned with the code (T), administrators with (A), and education inspectors with (E).

## **3. Findings**

The findings were presented in two main sections for opinions of participants of each group on who should perform the performance evaluation of teachers and for the grounds of such opinions. Accordingly, the first one of the themes obtained was named "evaluator" and the second one "grounds".

### *3.1 Theme 1: Evaluator*

The overall evaluation over 60 participants involved in the study, showed that the number of participants stating that performance evaluation of teachers should be performed by school principals is highest (39). School principals were followed by education inspectors (30), teachers' themselves (28), students (27), parents (23) and colleagues (22), respectively. An overall evaluation of study results showed that education inspectors, administrators and teachers expressed shared the opinion that the performance evaluation should be made by school principals. Among these three groups, the lowest number of participants expressed opinion in favor of parents and colleagues as evaluators.

The evaluation of the opinions of education inspectors revealed that it is the participants of education inspectors group highest in number (18/2) that expressed opinion in favor of education inspectors as evaluators. Education inspectors were followed by school principals (13/7), students (9/11), parents (9/11), teaches (8/12) and colleagues (8/12). More number of education inspectors expressed opinions in favor of education inspectors and school principals as evaluators while less education inspectors expressed opinion that the performance evaluation of teachers should be performed by teachers themselves, colleagues, students and parents.

The most number of administrators expressed opinion in favor of school principals (14/6) and school principals were followed by parents (9/11), colleagues (8/12), teachers' themselves (7/13), students (7/13) and education inspectors (6/14). More number of administrators expressed opinion that only school principals should

perform performance evaluation of teachers (14/6) while less number of administrators expressed opinion in favor of others. Namely, it can be claimed that they lean towards only school principals as evaluators.

The most number of teachers expressed opinion in favor of school principals (12/8), and school principals were followed by students (11/9), colleagues (6/14), education inspectors (6/14) and parents (5/15). More number of teachers expressed opinion in favor of teachers' themselves (13/7), school principals (12/8) and students (11/9) as evaluators while less number of teachers expressed opinion in favor of others (education inspectors, colleagues and parents).

Education inspectors said yes to education inspectors as evaluators in the ratio of (18/2) while administrators and teachers said no in the ratio of (6/14). The analysis of these ratios suggests that administrators and teachers do not lean towards education inspectors as an evaluator of performance.

Education inspectors said yes to school principals as evaluators in the ratio of (13/7), administrators of (14/6) and teachers of (12/8). It can be claimed that all of three groups lean towards school principal as performance evaluator. This result was only for school principals.

Education inspectors said no to teachers' themselves as evaluators in the ratio of (8/12), administrators said no in the ratio of (7/13) and teachers said yes in the ratio of (13/7). Education inspectors and administrators are not open up to teachers' themselves as evaluators. Only teachers stated that the evaluation should be performed by teachers.

Education inspectors said no to teachers' colleagues as evaluators in the ratio of (8/12), administrators said no in the ratio of (8/12) and teachers said no in the ratio of (6/14). According to these ratios, none of three groups leans toward teachers' colleagues as evaluators. Teachers were the group expressed unfavorable opinion in the highest ratio.

Education inspectors said no to students as evaluators in the ratio of (9/11), administrators said no in the ratio of (7/13) and teachers said yes in the ratio of (11/9). Only teachers found evaluation by students favorable.

Education inspectors said no to parents as evaluators in the ratio of (9/11), administrators said no in the ratio of (9/11) and teachers said no in the ratio of (5/15). The analysis of such ratios shows that in general, parents are not seemed unfavorable as evaluators. Among them, teachers express in the highest ratio that they are not willing to be evaluated by parents.

### 3.2 Theme 2: *Grounds*

Education inspectors expressed the opinion that the performance evaluation should be performed by education inspectors (8/12) while administrators (6/14) and teachers (6/14) expressed opinion quite oppositely that the performance evaluation should not be performed by education inspectors. Education inspectors stated, in the highest number, impartiality (14) and being suitably trained (4) as grounds for their choices

*"They are on arm's length basis with teachers, are objective, but not sentimental (E 14). I think they are objective since they will not see the teacher again (E 15). They are not prejudiced (E 17). Neither teachers are previously known to them nor they are hostile to or have a close relationship with them (E 18). They are objective as they are external to the organization (E 20)."*

Less number of administrators expressed opinion in favour of education inspectors as evaluators. They expressed this unfavourable opinion on the grounds that they cannot observe fully and adequately (14).

*"They do not have opportunity to observe adequately to perform evaluation (A 2). It is difficult to make a judgement based on short time observation (A 4). They have less information about teacher as they observe less (A 10). It is just for the day, not performed during the entire educational process (A 14). Those who are unable to observe the previous processes evaluates based on documents (A 19)."*

Teachers stated that this would be superficial and limited (11) and nothing but just document check (4).

*"An evaluation completed in a day would be superficial (T 2). A limited timeframe, I think it would not be reliable (T 6). It cannot be evaluated in a short time as one hour (T 8). It would be an evaluation just on paper, which does not take educational conditions into consideration (T 9). An evaluation of just one day is out of question, there may be exist different factors at that very moment (T 11). They cannot evaluate properly since they are not always at the school (T 16). Those who work under the same conditions should evaluate, they cannot monitor the changes (T 19)."*

Only inspectors are in the opinion that the evaluation should be performed by inspectors primarily on the grounds of impartiality/objectiveness (14).

According to school principals and teachers, inspectors should not be evaluator mainly on the grounds of superficial, limited, inadequate observation (29).

School principals and teachers are not negative towards education inspectors in terms of objectivity while there are negative opinions that evaluation might be superficial.

Education inspectors (13/7) expressed the opinion that the performance evaluation should be performed by school principals and also administrators (14/6) and teachers (12/8) expressed opinion in favour of school principals as evaluator. Education inspectors (13/7) based their opinion that the performance evaluation should

be performed by school principals on the most stated grounds that they observe in the best way (9), they are impartial (4) and know their staff (2).

*"They observe teacher in practice, finds the opportunity to observe non-class attitudes (E 15)" Observes teacher all year long, ensures the continuous success of teacher and influence the preparedness of teacher (E 16). Continuously observes the works of teacher, being closely acquainted with them (E 17). For immediate observation of teachers (E 5)."*

Administrators based their opinion that the performance evaluation should be performed by school principals on the most stated grounds that observation would be comprehensive and close (14) and that staff is known best by their administrators.

*"They can closely observe any kind of activity of a teacher (A 1). They closely monitor the works of teacher, thus performing a reliable evaluation (A 2). They observe teachers for an entire year, they are the head of an audit (A 6). They can monitor all attitudes and behaviours of teachers, attend classes, and data from students and parents are collected in the hands of school principals (A 7). They have a higher chance to observe teachers (A 10). They come from education and are continuously in close contact with teachers (A 14). They compare them with peers, observes them in all aspects (A 17)."*

Most number of teachers expressed opinion in favour of school principals as evaluators on the grounds that they are closely acquainted with them (6) and have the chance to observe them for longer periods (5)

*"They can observe teachers more closely and for longer periods (T 3). They work with teachers, get reliable and consistent information about them (T 6). They observe teacher for a year long and are those who know their performances best (T 10). They can follow teachers in many aspects (T 12). They observe teachers on the job and see what makes them bother (T 19)."*

All three groups favour school principals as evaluators with the most-stated grounds of close and continuous observation (38).

Less number of education inspectors (8/12) and administrators (7/13) expressed opinion in favour of teachers' themselves as evaluators while more number of teachers (13/7) expressed opinion in favour of them. Education inspectors based the opinion that evaluation should not be performed by teachers' themselves on the grounds that they cannot be objective (12) and incompetent to evaluate their own performance (2).

*"No one says his own buttermilk is sour (E 3). They cannot be unbiased, are unwilling to see their deficiencies (E 15). It is difficult to be objective (E 19). They would not be able to be objective (E 20). I do not think that they are ready to audit themselves, they would not be able to be objective (E 1). They evaluate sentimentally (E 5)."*

Administrators based their opinion that evaluation should not be performed by teachers most on the grounds that they cannot be unbiased (13) (they make their performance look better, they ignore hitches) .

*"Human by nature cannot find himself unsuccessful (A 1). He ignores hitches, turns himself off to improvement and development in case that he is not audited (A 5). He makes his performance look better not to give a negative impression (A 4). He cannot see his positives and negatives, does not accept his deficiencies (A 7). He might not objectively evaluate, reflect deficiencies (A 11). They cannot see their deficiencies easily (A 19)."*

Teachers based their opinion that evaluation should be performed by teachers' themselves most on the grounds that they are the ones who evaluate themselves best (10) and they are objective (2).

*"They are the ones who evaluate themselves best (T 1). They cannot lie to themselves, they have to adapt themselves (T 6). They know their deficiencies and pros (T 8). They are who best analyze the classroom condition, they can self-criticize (T 9). Self-evaluation is the best type of evaluation (T 10). One can be best known by himself and should be soul-searching (T 19)."*

Only teachers leaned towards the evaluation of teachers by teachers' themselves and based this opinion on the ground that they are the one would evaluate best (10)

Education inspectors and school principals stated opinion against teachers' themselves as evaluators as teachers cannot be unbiased (25).

Education inspectors stated opinion against teachers' colleagues as evaluators in the ratio of (8/12), administrators in the ratio of (8/12) and teachers in the ratio of (6/14). All three groups dissent to evaluation of teachers by their colleagues. Education inspectors stated the grounds that they cannot be objective (9) and this would lead to in-school conflicts (3) for their opinion that evaluation should not be performed by teachers' colleagues in highest number.

*"Colleague relationships hinder the ability to evaluate in an impartial manner, problems previously experienced with colleagues and grouping pose an obstacle (S 1). It leads to conflicts 'don't' teach me how to do my job (S 5). Liking/disliking takes precedence over performance (D 6). They might not be objective due to inferiority complex (S 16). It is difficult to be objective, jealousy, partiality may be involved (M 18). They might read the indicators wrong (M 19)."*

Administrators stated the grounds that they cannot be objective (12) and uneasiness would occur (5) for their opinion that evaluation should not be performed by teachers' colleagues in highest number.

*"They might not reflect the truth due to jealousy (A 2). There is competition, ambition, which may cause*

*uneasiness (A 3). Close relationships, sentimentality and negative communication climate between teachers hinder to act in an impartial manner (A 4). It depends on closeness, personal relationships and is partial (A 6). Evaluation is influenced by the previous negative experiences (A 11). Prejudices, political polarisations interfere with a reliable evaluation (A 12)."*

Teachers stated the grounds that they cannot be objective (14) for their opinion that performance evaluation of teachers should not be performed by teachers' colleagues in highest number.

*"Discrimination among teachers would affect evaluation negatively/positively (T 1). Personal disputes may occur, the evaluation would not be objective (T 3). Favoritism, not trying to lead embarrassment, trying not to give offence constitutes an impediment for objectivity (T 4). Conflicts and competition have an impact on objectivity (T 8). The factors like competition, dispute, politics, regionalism and sex undermine objectivity (T 10). All three groups dissented to evaluation of teachers by their colleagues on the grounds of objectivity (35). Those who dissented to evaluation of teachers by their colleagues in the highest number were teachers.*

Education inspectors and administrators expressed opinion against students as evaluators in the ratios of (9/11) and (7/13) while teachers expressed opinion in favour of students as evaluators in the ratio of (11/9). Education inspectors stated the grounds that they cannot be objective (6), they are not at an adequate level of competence (3), and they are open to be directed by others (2) for their opinion that evaluation should not be performed by students in the highest number.

*"The grade assigned to a student by a teacher would return to the teacher (S 1). They evaluate the teachers they like as good and those they dislike as bad (S 2). They would not be fair to the teachers they dislike (S 6). They might have different expectations (S 9). They act emotionally in evaluating (S 18). They act subjectively (S 19)."*

Administrators based the opinion that evaluation should not be performed by students on the grounds that they cannot be objective (9) and they cannot know evaluation criteria (7) in the highest number.

*"Students would evaluate teachers according to how teachers evaluates students - either positively - negatively (A 2). Students do not know evaluation criteria, there would be a contradiction in terms (A 4). They cannot measure the level of knowledge of teachers (A 5). They might evaluate according to the grades assigned to them (A 6). They cannot be objective, keep teachers under pressure (A 12). They might confuse feelings (A 15). Teachers are those who assign grades, which influence the objectivity of students (A 20)."*

Teachers stated the grounds that they would make the truest evaluation (8) and they are together with teachers in classroom environment in (3) in the highest number for the opinion in favour of students as evaluator.

*"They can see the progress, I think they would evaluate in the truest way (T 2). The best observers of a teacher are his/her students (T 4). They are together in the classroom all the time, therefore they can make true evaluation (T 8). The opinions of target group are important (T 10). They give the best feedback as they are together every day (T 14). They are the audience and you delivery your performance to them (T 20)."*

Teachers are in favour of students as evaluators on the grounds that they would make the truest evaluation (8). Education inspectors and school principals opposed to students as evaluators on the grounds that they cannot act objectively (15).

Education inspectors stated adverse opinion to parents as evaluators in the ratio of (9/11), administrators in the ratio of (9/11) and teachers in the ratio of (5/15). All three groups stated opinion against parents as evaluators. Education inspectors based the opinion that evaluation should not be performed by parents on the grounds that they cannot be objective (8) and they might not know the evaluation criteria (3) in the highest number.

*"Parents may bring their feelings in it, they are not involved in classroom environment and they cannot be objective (S 6). I believe that they cannot make objective and reliable decisions due to their socio-economic status (S 16). Some other factors than teacher's success in teaching may become prominent (S 18). They might not be informed of all works and efforts of the teacher (S 17). They may not evaluate teacher in all aspects, they may focus on irrelevant aspects (S 15)."*

Administrators based their opinion that evaluation should not be performed by parents on the grounds that they cannot be objective (9) and they are incompetent to evaluate (5) in the highest number.

*"They cannot perform a reliable, objective evaluation as they consider teachers as the reason for failure (A 2). Regional difference and illiteracy undermines objectivity (A 4). They cannot be objective, they have not appropriate educational and cultural background (A 5). They are not the expert of this subject matter, they are not trained for it (A 7). They have wrong point of view (such as that a teacher giving much homework is a good teacher), they are incompetent to evaluate (A 9). They have an emotional point of view, they cannot be objective, they evaluate based on not the characteristics and qualifications of teacher but their own point of view (A 10)."*

Teachers stated the grounds that they are not incompetent (7), they cannot act in an impartial manner (5), this would decrease the respect for this profession (4) and there is limited possibility to observe (3) in the highest number for their opinion that evaluation should not be performed by parents.

*"They have not the relevant knowledge (T 2). I think that they are not adequately-trained for this (T 8). They are not qualified for evaluating the performance of teacher and this trivializes teacher (T 13). They do not have the needed competency, their impartiality is doubtful (T 19). They do not have the adequate educational*

*background for this (T 20).*

All three groups of education inspectors, administrators and teachers stated opinion against parents as evaluators. Education inspectors and school principals based their opinion against parents as evaluators on the grounds of objectivity (17) while teachers based their opinion on incompetency (7).

#### **4. Discussion and Conclusion**

According to the results of this study in which school principals, teachers and education inspectors were involved, the opinion that in Turkish National Education System, the performance of teachers should be performed by school principals became prominent. Education inspectors, school principals and teachers agreed on this opinion. They stated as the grounds for this that they would observe in the best way, they know their personnel well and they can observe more closely. The studies by Akbaba, Altun and Memişoğlu (2008a) and Topçu (2010) show that a majority of teachers called for more active role of school principals in audit. It can be noted that these findings are results consistent with the body of literature. The body of literature sets out that in auditing employees, the best audit (evaluation) of an employee can be performed by their immediate supervisor. In the study by Akbaba Altun and Memişoğlu (2008b), teachers expressed opinion that the proportion of evaluation by administrators should be increased. Aslanargun and Göksoy (2013) indicated in their study that teachers are in the opinion that audit by school principals should be given weight for the reasons that in terms of auditing, they know teachers better than education inspectors and they can monitor performance more closely. School principals' ability to perceive the difference of performance of teachers is better. It is an advantage in evaluation of performance that school principals know well the teacher to be evaluated by them. A more accurate evaluation is, however, ensured if school principals who will perform performance evaluation are trained on this (Harris and Sass, 2014). Performance evaluation is an additional responsibility for school principals. This responsibility would also provide the school principals with the advantages of less role conflict and more job satisfaction (Catano and Stronge, 2006). The system of teacher performance evaluation implemented in Chilean educational system employs four instruments to evaluate performance of a teacher: a portfolio including examples of works by and a video-taped lesson of teacher, a self-evaluation form for teacher, a structured peer form and a report from supervisors. Teachers who will perform peer evaluation are specially trained on this and passed a test to be admitted. According to the authors, this system enables to evaluate skills of teachers and to correct their deficiencies (Avalos and Assael, 2006). Performance evaluation by school principals provides more effective results in estimating the future success of school organization. It was also found out that school principals are more successful in distinguishing effective and incompetent teachers when evaluating teachers. However, the school principals' probability of being incompetent or acting in a partial manner is considered as the limitations of this method (Jacob and Lefgren, 2005).

Evaluations from administrators are important in that they can observe the performances and problems of teachers and provide information about the effectiveness and value of teachers' performance (EARGED, 2000, s.31). Nevertheless, this opinion is considered applicable given that the school principal selection criteria and training conditions of the immediate supervisor, which is school principal, are met in ideal conditions. Otherwise, this may have undesirable consequences in case of selection of school principals based on incompetent or biased selection criteria. In parallel with this, this study also shows that education inspectors, school principals and teachers noted some unfavorable conditions such as school principals' probability to "act in a partial manner" in and "be incompetent" for evaluating. Aslanargun and Göksoy (2013) concluded that administrators might not be objective or act in partial way while Cemaloglu (2002) and Uçar (2001) concluded that school administrators do not have adequate knowledge to do this. Üzmez (2006) also noted that the fact that school principals are not expert in audit techniques is a disadvantage. Tonbul (2009) established that the close relationship with school principal and the possible uniformity of evaluation techniques may constitute a problem in evaluation by school administrators. In the study by Akşit (2006, p.89), teachers stated opinion that evaluation should be performed by school principal in spite of the fact that they have concerns about performance evaluation process being subjective and biased.

Another shared conclusion is that education inspections, school principals and teachers stated opinion in favor of parents and teachers' colleagues at the lowest ratio. The highest percentage of those who stated opinion against is formed by teachers. The most significant ground for this was that they cannot "be objective". This may imply that teachers do not trust in their peers. Trust of employees in their colleagues, however, underlies the significant concepts such as job satisfaction and commitment. Even though administrators and teachers accept to a large extent that education inspectors are competent, they stated opinion against education inspectors as evaluator. They based this opinion on the grounds that "they cannot observe fully and adequately and this would be a limited evaluation". In the study by Memduhoglu (2012), results indicated that audit duration is not sufficient. Yıldırım (2012) found out that education inspectors and ministry inspectors have, in general, a negative image in the eyes of participants. On the other hand, inspectors are the experts who determine whether organizational objectives are achieved, there is any deficiency and employees individually have job satisfaction.

They are also professional who identify and correct the deficiencies of, and improve, employees. Identification of problems of educational process and increase of efficiency make audit inevitable (Başar, 2000; Taymaz 2005). It is quite difficult to evaluate the performance of a teacher in a period of a lesson of a few hours and to observe the questions indicated on the audit forms in the form of behaviors.

Education inspectors and administrators stated opinion against teachers' themselves as evaluators. They base this opinion on the grounds that "they cannot be objective and impartial". Teachers, however, are the most strategic part of educational system. The environment where the organizational objectives are achieved are classrooms and those who achieve these objectives are teachers. Individual evaluation is one of the best ways of evaluation. One is best known by themselves. Tonbul (2009), found out, in contrary to these findings, that participants arrived at a consensus on the variables evaluation by group and self-evaluation, in the highest ratio. Education inspectors, administrators and teachers expressed opinion against peers as evaluators. They base this opinion on the grounds that "they cannot be objective". This can be considered that informal relationships and objectives other than the general objectives of organization are more effective in educational system. Akşit (2006) revealed that teachers are not pleased with peers as evaluators.

Audit by peers is a flexible audit approach on a volunteer basis where teachers evaluate peers in the process of observation, analysis and feedback under a supervision of a supervisor or auditor or solely under their own responsibility. The main philosophy underlying this approach is the thinking that what actually happens in a classroom and how these can be done in the best way under the current circumstances are best known by teachers and that the best teaching can be evaluated by peers in the most reliable way (Alfonso, 1977, Akt: Karakuş, 2010, p.186). Education inspectors and administrators expressed opinion against students as evaluators. They base this opinion on the grounds that "they cannot be objective and they might not know about evaluation criteria". Students, indeed, are among those who can best evaluate a teacher. The low rate of this option and the option of parents which are emphasized by incompetency, as highlighted in the study by Akbaba Altun and Memişoglu (2008), also demonstrates that education inspectors, school principals and teachers also do not have the adequate knowledge needed for establishing criteria for evaluation of teachers. This is because the evaluation questions asked to the subordinates do not include questions related to the fields in which subordinates are not adequate. Tonbul (2009) indicated in his study that participants do not have adequate knowledge for performance evaluation. In fact, students are those who will determine how well a teacher performs in their practice since they are the one who received the service (Ertan Kantos, 2013, p.68).

Education inspectors, administrators and teachers expressed opinion against parents as evaluators. Specifically, teachers are not willing to be evaluated by parents. They base this opinion on the grounds that "they cannot be objective and they are inadequate to evaluate". Parents are the primary external factors affecting school administration. Here, the evaluation questions to be asked to parents will be those which parents are able to answer. These will not be questions for determining the competencies related to their fields. An attitude is exhibited, which may lead to the exclusion of parents from the system of education. We cannot reach out students if we cannot reach out parents. Akşit (2006) stated in their study that teachers are not willing to be evaluated by parents. Only teachers favor students as evaluators. It can be considered pleasing for our system of education that a positive point of view that teachers express about their students. As stated by Akşit (2006), about half of teachers asked to be evaluated by their students. All of three participants ranked themselves first for the question of who should perform the evaluation. Tonbul (2009) indicated that administrators and inspectors ranked themselves too high. In the study by Akşit (2006), 63% of teachers involved in the study stated that self-evaluation should be included in performance evaluation. According to the general results, it can be claimed that lack of confidence in education inspection implies that this organization should restructure itself. The root causes of this lack of confidence and solutions therefor should be found. It can be possible that the task of evaluating teachers be assigned to school principals provided that the issue of qualification is resolved. Education inspectors may also be put at disposal of teachers and schools for long periods, including the roles of guiding and developing more into the process. In addition, the issue of lack of confidence (qualification and impartiality) among the elements of inspectors, school principals, teachers, students and parents involved in the National System of Education should be resolved by the system's itself.

Besides, results of the study showed that the major problem is objectivity. Education inspectors, school principals and teachers based their negative opinions on the grounds of the issue of objectivity. That is to say that the major players of the system of education do not trust each other. In the study by Akbaba, Altun and Memişoglu (2008a), the school administrators' and teachers' opinions about the objectivity of the evaluation criteria became prominent. Also in the study by Memduhoğlu (2012), almost all of administrators, teachers and inspectors, there is an issue of trust between the inspectors and the teachers and administrators. This could be considered as a thought-provoking in terms of the system of education. Koç (2006) stated that the major problem arisen is how the evaluation is or will be performed and how an objective, fair, reliable and applicable system can be established. The study by Soydan (2012) confirmed that administrators and teachers stated that performance evaluation cannot be operated in a fair manner. Akşit (2006) found that teachers do not have

confidence in the evaluation process. Re-establishment of criteria for selection, assignation and promotion of education inspections, administrators and teachers and provision of knowledge of what performance evaluation is and how it is performed to education inspections, administrators and teachers (during or before service) should be dealt with as a priority.

## References

Akbaba Altun, S., & Memişoğlu, S.P. (2008a). Performans değerlendirmesine ilişkin öğretmen, yönetici ve müfettiş görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 53, 7-24.

Altun, S. A., & Memişoğlu, S. P. (2008). İlköğretim okullarında çoklu veri kaynağına dayalı Performans değerlendirmesine ilişkin nitel bir çalışma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 14(2), 151-179.

Aksit, F. (2006). Performans değerlendirmeye ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2, 76-101.

Argon, T. (2010). Akademisyenlerin Performans Değerlendirme, Motivasyon ve ÖrgütSEL Adalet İle İlgili Görüşlerine İlişkin Nitel Bir Çalışma *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2 (1), 133-180.

Aslanargun, E. & Göksoy, S. (2013). Öğretmen denetimini kim yapmalıdır? *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi Özel sayı*, 14, 98-121.

Avalos, B., & Assael, J. (2006). Moving from resistance to agreement: The case of the Chilean teacher performance evaluation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 45(4), 254-266.

Aydın, İ. (2005). Öğretimde denetim. Pegem A Yayıncılık Ankara

Aydın, M. (1986). Çağdaş eğitim denetimi. 2. Baskı Ankara

Başar, H. (2000). Eğitim denetçisi. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık

Berg L., B. & Lune, H.(2012). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. London: Pearson.

Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2006). What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *NASSP bulletin*, 90(3), 221-237.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2002). Öğretmen performansının artırılmasında okul yöneticisinin rolü. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 153(154), 153-154.

Çalık, T. (2003). Performans yönetimi tanımlar kavramlar ilkeler. Ankara: Gündüz Eğitim Yayıncılık

Creswell, J. W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

De Cenzo, D. & Robbins, S. (1988). Performance appraisals: Personel Human Resource management. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs.

Demirkasimoglu, N. (2011). Türk Eğitim Sistemi’nde Bir Alt Sistem Olan Denetim Sisteminin Seçilmiş Bazı Ülkelerin Denetim Sistemleri ile Karşılaştırılması. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 23(23), 23-48.

EARGED (2000). Öğretmenlerin performans değerlendirme modeli ve sicil raporları. Araştırma Danışmanı: İnayet Pehlivan Ankara: MEB Basımevi

Eroğlu, E. & Erden, D. (2006). Earged okulda performans yönetim modeli. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Kantos, Z. E. (2013). Performans değerlendirme süreci ve 360 derece geri bildirim sistemi. *Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama Dergisi*, 12(23), 59-76.

Fındıkçı, İ. (1999). İnsan kaynakları yönetimi. İstanbul, Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım

Glickman, Carl D., Gordon, Stephen P., Ross-Gordon, & Jovita M. (2014). Denetim ve Öğretimsel Liderlik gelişimsel Bir Yaklaşım (Çeviri Editörleri: Mualla Bilgin Aksu, Esmahan Ağaoğlu) Ankara Anı Yayıncılık

Günbayı, İ., & Yıldırım, S. (2012). Performans Yönetimine İlişkin Yönetici ve Öğretmen Görüşleri (Antalya İli Örneği). *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi*, 1(2), 1-22

Gündüz, Y., & Balyer, A. (2011). Eğitim denetiminde alternatif yaklaşımlar. M. Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi 3, 61-78.

Harris, D. N., & Sass, T. R. (2014). Skills, productivity and the evaluation of teacher performance. *Economics of Education Review*, 40, 183-204.

Jacob, B. A., & Lefgren, L. (2005). Principals as agents: Subjective performance measurement in education (No. w11463). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Karakuş, M. (2010). Çağdaş denetim yaklaşımları. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(2), 181-200.

Karip, E., Eroğlu, E., & Erden, D. (2002). Eğitimi araştırma ve geliştirme daire başkanlığı okulda performans yönetimi modeli (Taslak), MEB Yayınları, Ankara.

Koç, M. (2006). Kamu personel rejimi içerisinde devlet memurlarının başarısının değerlendirilmesi ve başarıya dayalı ücretin devlet memurlarına uygulanabilirliği. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2014). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry*. Pearson Higher Ed.

MEB Teftiş Kurulu (2005). İlköğretimde denetim ve performans değerlendirme esasları. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2012). Öğretmen, yönetici, denetmen ve öğretim üyelerinin görüşlerine göre Türkiye'de eğitim denetimi sorunsalı. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(1), 135-156.

Neuman, W.L. (2006). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Toronto: Pearson.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. *The qualitative report*, 12(2), 281-316.

Palmer, Margaret.J.(1993). Performans Değerlendirmeleri (Çeviren: Doğan Şahiner) Reprosal Matbaası, İstanbul.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*, 3, 344-347

Resmi Gazete (2015). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Atama ve Yer Değiştirme Yönetmeliği

Sabuncuoğlu, Z. (2000). İnsan kaynakları yönetimi. Bursa: Ezgi Kitapevi

Soydan, T. (2012). Eğitim Alanında Performans Değerlendirme Sisteminin Geçerliği Üzerine Yönetici ve Öğretmen Görüşlerine Dayalı Bir Araştırma. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 13(1), 1-25.

Taymaz, H. (2005). Eğitim sisteminde teftiş: kavramlar, ilkeler, yöntemler. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Tonbul, Y. (2009). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerine yönelik performans değerlendirme modelinin bazı değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Abant İzzet baysal Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9(2), 1-22.

Topçu, İ. (2010). Devlet ve özel ilköğretim okullarında yöneticilerin öğretimin denetimi görevlerini yerine getirme biçimleri. *C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 34(2), 31-39

Uçar, A. (2001). İstanbul ili ilköğretim okul öğretmenlerinin performans değerlendirmesi. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Uyargil, C. (2007). İşletmelerde performans yönetimi sistemi: performansın planlanması değerlendirilmesi ve geliştirilmesi. İstanbul: Arıkan Basım Dağıtım

Uyargil, C. (2009). İnsan kaynakları yönetimi. 4. Baskı İstanbul: Beta Yayınları

Üzmez, İ. T. (1996). İlk ve orta öğretim kurumlarında performans değerlendirme süreci- sicil raporu düzenlenmesine ilişkin sorunlar ve beklentiler (Elazığ ili örneği) . (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ).

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, A. (2005). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri. Genişletilmiş 5. Baskı Seçkin, Ankara

Yıldırım, N. (2012). Eğitim denetmeni ve bakanlık denetmeni imajları üzerine karşılaştırılmalı bir çalışma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi* 18(1), 143-166.